WHAT IS "JEWISH" LITERATURE?

I.

BY PROF. DR. W. BACHER.

MIT scharfsinnigen Argumenten und dem Rüstzeuge der Logik hat es S. Levy unternommen (*J. Q. R.*, XV, 583-603), den Begriff und Umfang der "jüdischen Litteratur" näher zu bestimmen, und er ist zu einem Ergebnisse gelangt, das man auf mildeste Weise als paradox bezeichnen kann. Demnach gehören zur jüdischen Litteratur, die aber korrekterweise "hebräische Litteratur" zu nennen wäre, nur solche Werke, die — sei es durch Juden, sei es durch Nichtjuden — in hebräischer Sprache über welchen Gegenstand immer verfasst wurden. Was in anderen Sprachen von Juden und über Judenthum geschrieben wurde und wird, darf nicht zu dem unter dem Namen "Jüdische Litteratur" zusammengefassten Litteraturgebiete gerechnet werden. Nur zwei Ausnahmen lässt der Verfasser gelten, welche diese von dem Merkmale der Sprache ausgehende Definition durchbrechen; die eine Ausnahme giebt er ausdrücklich zu, die andere hat er stillschweigend, vielleicht unbewusst, jedenfalls aber unbedacht, durch das Netz seiner scheinbar so streng logischen Argumentation durchschlüpfen lassen.

Die von Levy ausdrücklich zugegebene Ausnahme betrifft den jüdisch-deutschen Jargon, das "Yiddish," wie man jetzt den Dialekt der polnischen und russischen Juden zu nennen sich gewöhnt hat. Die in diesem Dialekte verfassten Schriften gehören nach Levy, wenn sie in hebräischen Buchstaben geschrieben und gedruckt sind, zur hebräischen Litteratur. "Yiddish" ist also nach Levy nicht etwa ein Dialekt des Deutschen, sondern ein hebräischer Dialekt.

Er weist zwar im Vorübergehen auch auf das Jüdisch-Spanische, Jüdisch-Portugiesische, Jüdisch-Persische hin (S. 600); aber nur für das Jüdisch-Deutsche constatirt er die Zugehörigkeit zur jüdischen (hebräischen) Litteratur, und zwar ausdrücklich auf Grund der Thatsache, dass diese Litteratur sich in hebräischen Buchstaben darbietet. Die hebräischen Charaktere weisen darauf hin, dass "die Autoren sich nicht ausserhalb des Bereiches der hebräischen Litteratur fühlen." Dass aber die grossen jüdischen Autoren des Mittelalters ihr Arabisch, dass Mendelssohn und seine Jünger ihr Deutsch in hebräischen Lettern schrieben, genügt auch für Herrn S. Levy nicht als Ursache, um die betreffenden Litteraturerzeugnisse der hebräischen Litteratur zuzuzählen. Hingegen war es offenbar in erster Reihe das Moment der Schrift, welches zu der von ihm stillschweigend zugegebenen anderen Ausnahme den Anlass gab; diese Ausnahme betrifft die aramäischen Bestandteile der jüdischen Litteratur, die bekanntlich schon das biblische Schriftthum zu einem zweisprachigen machen. Weder die aramäischen Bestandteile der Bibel (in den Büchern Daniel und Esra), noch die aramäisch oder theilweise aramäisch geschriebenen Werke der Traditionslitteratur nehmen eine Stelle in den Erwägungen des Verfassers ein, der ja vermöge der sprachlichen Grundlage seiner Definition auch alles Aramäische aus dem Bereiche der jüdischen — d. h. hebräischen — Litteratur hätte ausschliessen müssen.

Aber keine solche Äusserung findet sich in seinen Argumentationen; vielmehr scheint er als selbstverständlich anzunehmen, dass die aramäischen Geisteserzeugnisse jüdischer Autoren ohne weiteres den hebräischen Werken gleichgestellt werden müssen. Dass wir das "Targum des Proselyten Onkelos" mit dem Texte des Pentateuchs verbinden, ist für Levy nur deshalb erwähnenswerth (S. 590), weil sein Autor ein geborener, wenn auch zum Judenthume übergetretener Heide war; das Aramäisch des Targum benimmt diesem in den Augen des sonst so rigorosen Kritikers nicht das Recht der Zugehörigkeit zur "hebräischen

Litteratur." Ihm gelten also das Targum und die aramäischen Theile von Talmud und Midrasch, da sie in hebräischer Schrift erhalten sind, als unzweifelhafte Bestandtheile der hebräischen Litteratur. Unbewusst wird vielleicht auch die Thatsache der nahen Verwandtschaft des Aramäischen mit dem Hebräischen dabei massgebend gewesen sein; aber in den Darlegungen Levy's spielt diese Thatsache keine Rolle, wie die Verwandtschaft des Hebräischen mit dem Arabischen ihn nicht daran verhindert hat, die in arabischer Sprache verfassten Werke jüdischer Autoren über jüdische Gegenstände von der jüdischen Litteratur auszuschliessen und der arabischen Litteratur zuzurechnen. Wenn er im Sinne seiner Definition des Begriffes "Jüdische Litteratur" consequent verfahren wollte, müsste er aus dem Umfange dieses Begriffes auch die aramäischen Schriften jüdischer Herkunft, ja selbst die aramäischen Capitel der Bücher Daniel und Esra ausschliessen und dieselben etwa mit den aramäischen (syrischen) Schriften christlicher Herkunft und sonstigen aramäischen Litteraturprodukten in das Gebiet der "aramäischen Litteratur" verweisen. Wenn sonst durch die Ausnahmen die Regel bestätigt wird, so genügen in unserem Falle die beiden Ausnahmen, welche Levy bei seiner Begriffsbestimmung der jüdischen Litteratur gelten lassen muss, um die Unrichtigkeit dieser Begriffsbestimmung darzuthun. Denn da er die Traditionslitteratur (Talmud und Midrasch) nicht des Rechtes, zur jüdischen Litteratur gezählt zu werden, berauben kann, muss er die Verschiedenheit des Hebräischen und Aramäischen ignoriren; und da er die in "Yiddish" verfassten Geistesprodukte der Gegenwart der jüdischen Litteratur, wie er sie auffasst, einreihen will, muss er — auf Grund des äusserlichen Momentes der Schriftcharaktere — den jüdisch-deutschen Dialekt zum Dialekt des Hebräischen stempeln.

Aber auch von diesen beiden, die Levy'sche Definition des Begriffes "Jüdische Litteratur" — als Litteratur in hebräischer Sprache — durchbrechenden Ausnahmen abgesehen, muss eine Erwägung der Consequenzen dieser Definition zur

Erkenntniss ihrer Unrichtigkeit führen. Man erwäge nur, was alles nach Levy nicht zur jüdischen Litteratur gehört. Die ganze Litteratur des jüdischen Hellenismus, die arabischen Schriften der Vertreter der mittelalterlichen Blüthezeit des jüdischen Geistes, die Werke, in denen die moderne Wissenschaft des Judenthums begründet und entfaltet wurde, soweit sie nicht hebräisch geschrieben sind, alle diese Erzeugnisse des jüdischen Geistes sind nicht als jüdische Litteratur zu betrachten. Und um, wie es Levy thut, mit Einzelheiten zu exemplifiziren, so gehört nach ihm wohl die hebräische Übersetzung irgend eines griechischen, deutschen oder englischen Werkes zur jüdischen Litteratur, während die Septuaginta, die Bibelübersetzungen Saadjas, Mendelssohns von ihr ausgeschlossen sind. Maimûni's *Führer*, Jehuda Halevi's *Kusari*, sind in ihrem Originale nicht jüdische Litteratur, wohl aber eine hebräische Übersetzung aus Aristoteles oder Kant. Jüdische Litteratur wäre die hebräisch geschriebene Broschüre eines christlichen Missionärs, nicht aber eine nicht hebräisch verfasste jüdische Religionslehre oder jüdische Predigt. Der Widersinn liegt auf der Hand; und ebenso ist es offenbar, dass Alle, die bisher die jüdische Litteratur zum Gegenstande von Gesammtdarstellungen und Einzelforschungen gemacht haben, unter ihr etwas ganz anderes verstanden, als die in hebräischer Sprache verfassten Werke beliebigen Inhaltes und beliebiger Herkunft.

Der Grundirrthum, welcher die zu so merkwürdigen Consequenzen führende Definition der jüdischen Litteratur, wie sie S. Levy bietet, veranlasste, liegt in dem Umstande, dass er bei seiner Begriffsbestimmung von den Nationallitteraturen anderer Völker ausgeht, deren Hauptkennzeichen allerdings die nationale Sprache bildet. Aber er vergass, dass für die Juden, wenn sie auch als volkliche Einheit bis auf den heutigen Tag sich erhalten haben, die hebräische Sprache, ehemals die nationale Sprache Israels, durchaus nicht in demselben Sinne nationale Sprache geblieben ist, wie die Sprachen anderer Culturvölker, deren Litteraturen er zur Vergleichung mit der jüdischen Litteratur

heranzieht. Ein bekannter jüdischer Autor des 13. Jahrhunderts, Tanchum Jeruschalmi, sagt in der Einleitung zu seinem arabisch geschriebenen hebräischen Wörterbuche: "Wir sind eine Nation ohne eigene Sprache."[1] Er spricht damit einen Gemeinplatz aus, aber für die vorliegende Frage hat diese präcise Formulirung des Thatbestandes den Werth eines entscheidenden Argumentes. Nachdem Israel's Sprache schon in Palästina zur Zeit des zweiten Tempels nicht mehr ausschliesslich die hebräische war; nachdem ein beträchtlicher Theil des jüdischen Volkes schon im Alterthume eine dem Hebräischen so fern stehende Sprache, wie das Griechische, zur Hervorbringung eines reichen Schriftthumes anwendete; nachdem die in allen Culturländern zerstreut lebenden Juden in ihren litterarischen Produkten, den Erzeugnissen des niemals rastenden jüdischen Geistes, ihre jeweilige Muttersprache ebensosehr und oft in noch grösserem Maasse anwendeten und anwenden, als die geheiligte Sprache der Bibel und das als Gelehrtensprache zu bezeichnende, theils hebräische, theils aramäische und vielfach gemengte Idiom der Traditionslitteratur: so muss es als ganz ungeschichtliches, ja als unlogisches Verfahren bezeichnet werden, wenn man sich bei der Bestimmung des Begriffes der jüdischen Litteratur an das Merkmal des einheitlichen Sprachcharakters klammert und, anstatt den zu definirenden Begriff genau zu bestimmen, einen anderen Begriff, den der "hebräischen Litteratur," an seine Stelle setzt.

Thatsächlich ist jüdische Litteratur nichts anderes als Litteratur der Juden, insoweit in ihr die geistigen Bestrebungen und geistigen Richtungen der Bekenner des Judenthums als solcher und als Angehörige der jüdischen Gemeinschaft zum Ausdrucke gelangen. Die Sprachen, in denen die Werke der jüdischen Litteratur verfasst sind, sind eben die Sprachen, welche neben dem Hebräischen zum Vehikel des jüdischen Geistes geworden sind. Dass ein grosser Theil der jüdischen Litteratur hebräisch ist,

[1] S. mein *Aus dem Wörterbuche Tanchum Jeruschalmi's* (Strassburg, 1903), S. 24.

ergiebt sich aus der Stelle und der Bedeutung, welche dem Hebräischen in dem geistigen Leben, in der religiösen und wissenschaftlichen Cultur der jüdischen Gesammtheit zukommt.

Auch die neueste Bewegung innerhalb eines grossen Theiles der Judenheit, die das Hebräische zur lebenden Sprache machen will und die namentlich auf den ausschliesslichen Gebrauch des Hebräischen als jüdische Litteratursprache hinstrebt, kann an der geschichtlichen Thatsache nicht ändern, dass seit zwei Jahrtausenden der jüdische Geist in vielen Sprachen sich kundgab und eine vielsprachige Litteratur hervorbrachte, die man aber wegen dieser Vielsprachigkeit nicht der einheitlichen Bezeichnung "Jüdische Litteratur" berauben darf. Andererseits aber bringt es die bereits erwähnte besondere Stellung, die das Hebräische im geistigen Leben der Juden bis auf den heutigen Tag einnimmt, mit sich, dass man hebräisch geschriebene Werke, wenn deren Gegenstand auch nicht Juden und Judenthum angeht, zur jüdischen Litteratur zu zählen gewohnt ist; und mit Recht, denn auch in diesen Werken, insoweit sie Juden zu Urhebern haben und insoweit in ihnen anderssprachige Litteraturprodukte übersetzt oder irgend ein Gebiet menschlichen Denkens und Dichtens durch Bearbeitung in hebräischer Sprache einem jüdischen Leserkreise zugänglich gemacht werden soll,—auch in diesen Werken gelangte und gelangt das Streben des jüdischen Geistes zum Ausdrucke. Wer würde das grosse Litteraturgebiet, das Steinschneider in seinem klassischen Werke über die hebräischen Übersetzungen der Juden im Mittelalter dargestellt hat, der Zugehörigkeit zur jüdischen Litteratur verlustig erklären? Hingegen wird Niemand den Kreis der jüdischen Litteratur so weit ziehen, dass zum grösseren Ruhme derselben die Erzeugnisse jüdischer Schriftsteller, auch wenn ihr Inhalt keine Beziehung zum Judenthume hat, als zu ihr gehörig betrachtet werden. Süsskind von Trimberg, der deutsche Minnesänger, verdient wohl Erwähnung in der Geschichte der Juden, aber seine Lieder gehören nicht zur jüdischen Litteratur,

sondern sind ein integrirender Bestandtheil der deutschen Litteratur. Die zahllosen Schriftsteller jüdischer Herkunft, die seit hundert Jahren die Nationallitteraturen Europas mit so mannigfaltigen, theilweise klassischen Werken bereicherten, haben nur selten auch zur jüdischen Litteratur beigetragen. Es hat also auch der bisherige Sprachgebrauch genügend darauf geachtet, dass dem Begriffe der jüdischen Litteratur ihr nicht zugehörige Elemente ferne gehalten werden. Und wenn in feindseliger Weise von "jüdischer Presse" gesprochen wird, wo die von Juden oder als Juden geltenden Schriftstellern geleitete und producirte Journalistik getroffen werden soll, so ist das eine bekannte Fälschung des Sprachgebrauches, die keinen Denkenden irreführen wird.

Die von Levy als besondere Classe von Litteraturwerken (seine Nummer II, S. 601) hervorgehobenen Schriften von Nichtjuden in hebräischer Sprache verdienen thatsächlich nur als Curiosum Erwähnung; als Bestandtheil der jüdischen Litteratur kommen sie nicht in Betracht. Aber auch die von Levy unter Nummer IV zusammengefassten Schriften kann man nur in weiterem Sinne zur jüdischen Litteratur rechnen. Basnage's *Histoire des Juifs* oder Franz Delitzsch's *Zur Geschichte der jüdischen Poesie* sind ihrem Inhalte nach neben die Werke jüdischer Autoren über jüdische Geschichte und hebräische Poesie zu stellen, aber zur jüdischen Litteratur dürfen sie dennoch nicht gezählt werden. Als erstes Merkmal für die Zugehörigkeit eines Werkes zur jüdischen Litteratur wird nach dem geltenden Sprachgebrauche und auch nach den obigen Ausführungen die Zugehörigkeit des Autors zur jüdischen Gemeinschaft betrachtet werden müssen [1].

BUDAPEST.

[1] Ein Versehen Levy's sei noch berichtigt. Er erinnert sich nicht, יהודית als Bezeichnung der hebräischen Sprache anderwärts als II. Kön. xviii. 26 und 28 gefunden zu haben (S. 586). Aber es entging ihm, dass dieser — neben שפת כנען (Jes. xix. 18) — älteste Name der hebräischen Sprache auf noch charakteristischere Weise von Nehemia (xiii. 24) angewendet wird. Seit die obigen Ausführungen geschrieben wurden (August

II.

By the Rev. A. Wolf, M.A.

Is there a Jewish literature? asks the Rev. S. Levy. His first answer is, "the Jews possess a literature which is peculiarly their own," but "that literature" cannot be "correctly described by the term 'Jewish' literature." After five pages of argument he makes the assertion boldly that there is "no Jewish literature." Finally, however, Mr. Levy merely claims "that it is the first consistent attempt to define the scope of what has hitherto been erroneously known as Jewish literature, but which should more correctly be called Hebrew literature."

"Obviously the theme resolves itself into an exercise in definition," such is Mr. Levy's estimate of the problem, which he himself propounds. But sound inquiry never resolves itself into an exercise in definition. To think that it does is simply to repeat the old error of mediaeval philosophers and theologians, who, instead of adjusting definitions to things, tried to fit things to definitions, and so brought philosophy and theology into disrepute. Every sound inquiry starts from the real things, not the definition of their name or names. Only after a careful study of the actual character of the things denoted by a name can one venture on a definition of that term. Even then, as knowledge advances, and new facts are disclosed, old definitions must adapt themselves to new conditions. Definitions are the last, not the first consideration. On closer examination, moreover, it will be found that it is

1903), hat sich auch der Altmeister der jüdischen Litteratur, Prof. Steinschneider, über die Frage, und zwar auch mit Bezug auf den Artikel Levy's geäussert (*Zeitschrift für Hebräische Bibliographie*, VII, 120 ff.). Er schliesst mit den Worten: "Die Berechtigung der nichthebräischen Schriften der Juden zu einem Platze in der Kulturgeschichte der Juden wird ihr auch von denen nicht abgesprochen, welche über die Bezeichnung 'Jüdische Litteratur' sich zu Absurditäten verirren."

only in the case of strictly scientific or technical terms that definitions are either possible or important. As regards most names in daily use their exact definition is generally unknown and considered of little moment; their denotation is our chief concern.

When, therefore, Jewish literature is made the subject of inquiry our first thought is that of the things or writings, or some of them, which the term denotes, not the definition of the term. The way, too, in which Mr. Levy states his problem seems specially calculated to direct our attention to the denotation, not to the definition of the term. "*Is* there a Jewish literature?" This can only refer to the thing, not to the definition. If the question really meant what it says, our whole task would be simply to find out whether there is anything actually existing which is called Jewish literature. In that case there could be but one answer to the question. There *is* a Jewish literature. For Mr. Levy himself grants that "the Jews possess a literature which is peculiarly their own"; he even enumerates five classes of books, some of which, at any rate, actually exist and are generally referred to as Jewish literature; while the society to which Mr. Levy propounded his enigma is but one of many societies called into existence by it. What more does one need to prove, if proof were necessary, that there is a Jewish literature?

But Mr. Levy really discusses a different question. "Granted that the Jews possess a literature which is peculiarly their own, is that literature best or correctly described by the term Jewish literature?" The real problem, then, relates to the legitimacy of the expression Jewish literature. And I have already indicated the right method of pursuing such inquiries. The proper thing to do would be this: first enumerate the various classes of books or writings, which are generally included under the general designation Jewish literature; then by carefully comparing these try to extract the actual signification that underlies the general application of the term; next inquire

whether the term under consideration is sufficiently appropriate to its actual application, or whether some other expression might serve that same purpose better.

The final outcome of Mr. Levy's article is this, "that the expression 'Jewish' literature is incorrect, and that we must substitute for it 'Hebrew' literature." In reply to this I suggest that the expression Jewish literature is not incorrect; and that the ordinary differentiation between the expressions Jewish literature and Hebrew literature is very convenient and perfectly legitimate.

"The language in which the works are written is the sole and all-important criterion in any definition of literature." "No language, no literature, no Jewish language, no Jewish literature. There is a Hebrew language, so we must speak of Hebrew literature." Such is Mr. Levy's line of argument, briefly summarized in his own words. The ghost of mediaevalism seems to haunt them. It would seem that literature in the abstract when defined by a certain epithet becomes a concrete, individual literature. What, then, must that qualifying adjective be? The name of the language, says Mr. Levy. "The epithet applied to the literature must invariably be identical with the epithet applied to the language. No language, no literature." And this language-epithet "is the sole and all-important criterion in any definition of literature."

To start from such a dogmatic premiss and draw such a conclusion is what is called riding for a fall. The conclusion is consistent enough with the premiss, but it is in glaring contradiction with the facts. But, then, facts do not matter: definition is the all-important consideration; "the theme resolves itself into an exercise in definition," according to Mr. Levy. And definition is the fixed idea which vitiates his train of reasoning. When, moreover, Mr. Levy extends the denotation of the term Hebrew literature so as to include Yiddish literature, then he is not even consistent. Does Yiddish become Hebrew when printed in Hebrew characters? Does German literature

become Latin if printed in Latin characters? And yet there are probably quite as many Latin words in German, English, &c., as there are Hebrew words in Yiddish. Yiddish, considered as a language (and from Mr. Levy's standpoint that should be our only consideration), is much more akin to German (or Spanish, &c., as the case may be) than it is to Hebrew. Do Arabic books printed in Hebrew characters become Hebrew books?

Leaving definitions and other abstractions alone for awhile let us approach the problem somewhat differently. Let us suppose we are in the reading-room of the British Museum, and are told that it contains the literature of the whole world. If we stop to examine some considerable portion of this literature we shall be impressed by the heterogeneity of the collection rather than by its homogeneity. For we shall find that it consists of works composed in many different languages, by ever so many different authors, in different lands, at different times, and on the most diverse topics. If we are quite indifferent to all book-lore we shall not concern ourselves about the actual composition of this library of the world's literature. Or again, one of us might be a Methuselah, and, like Bacon, make all knowledge his province, such a one, too, might be fairly indifferent at first about the classification of the world's literature, except perhaps about some sort of arrangement in order of difficulty. Most of us, however, would probably be equally far removed from the extreme indifference of our former supposition and the universal interest of the second. We should accordingly direct our attention to some one portion of this world-literature, according to our several interests and accomplishments. And here the importance of a classification of literature will make itself felt. But of what sort is the classification to be? If one of us is a philologist he will want the classification to be based on differences of language; and such a course may also be convenient for many others who have no special educational interests, but whose reading,

however haphazard, is restricted to some one language. Some one else, on the other hand, may be interested in the literary evolution of some particular country or countries; or in the literary history of some race or races; or he may transcend differences of country, language, and people, and be specially interested in some definite epoch; or he may be absorbed in tracing human thought in some one direction without special regard for linguistic, geographic, or temporal differences. Each of these would occasion a different scheme of classification. Each classification will be the best for its special purpose. Who can decide which is the best absolutely? Logic knows of no exclusively valid *fundamentum divisionis*; that *fundamentum* is best which is most appropriate to the purpose in view. For library purposes an alphabetical classification is the best, however arbitrary it may seem. Hence to classify literature on a racial *fundamentum*, when we are especially interested in the literary history of a particular people, is just as logical and legitimate as any other kind of classification, made for another purpose.

Actual usage will, I think, be found to confirm the preceding remarks. When we speak of literature simply, without any qualification (not even such as is implied by a particular universe of discourse), then we usually mean the literature of the world; by limiting the term we generally specify some more or less definite group of works related by some common characteristic which is indicated by the qualifying epithet, and constitutes, for the time being, the *fundamentum divisionis*, and is different for different purposes. Thus we commonly meet with such expressions as English literature, German literature, &c.; European literature, Oriental literature, American literature; ancient, mediaeval, or modern literature; Christian literature, Buddhist literature, &c.; psychological literature, metaphysical literature, &c.; and so on. In each of the preceding groups of expressions we have a different kind of *fundamentum*; but logic raises no objection whatever

against different classifications from different standpoints. The relative merits of each *fundamentum* depend on convenience and propriety. And there is a decided advantage in having such different classifications. For we are enabled thereby to specify all sorts of subdivisions with a precision and neatness that would be impossible otherwise.

The case of literature is not unique in this respect. The practice of having several parallel classifications is more or less universal. Take the parallel case of mankind, or people. Ordinary language and usage embody quite a number of independent classifications. We are classed as white or coloured; as English, American, German, &c.; as English-speaking, German-speaking, &c.; as Buddhist, Christian, &c.; as professional, artisan, &c.; and so on. Here, too, each classification rests on a different, but (for its purpose) equally legitimate distinction. Thus, for example, Mr. Levy himself is sometimes classed as an Englishman, sometimes as a Jew, and sometimes as a minister. The three separate classifications here assumed are equally logical and equally useful for different objects. And the advantage of having all instead of one only is exemplified by such an expression as the Anglo-Jewish clergy, which is incomparably more exact and useful than any one of its constituents would be if we wanted to refer to the same people. In precisely the same way, namely, by indicating the lines of intersection between the several class-schemes, we may and do describe writings like those of Mr. Abrahams and Mr. Zangwill as Anglo-Jewish literature; books like those of Mendelssohn as German-Jewish literature; books like the *Guide* as Arabic-Jewish literature; and so on. If necessary (everything depends on our object) we may further or otherwise specify these as historical, or fiction, or apologetic, or philosophical, as the case may be. Mr. Levy's intricate cases are really very simple.

Mr. Levy, however, will not have it so. To include Mr. Zangwill's *Dreamers of the Ghetto* in Jewish literature,

because written by a Jew, and then to include it in English literature, because written in English, cannot possibly be right, according to Mr. Levy. "It is inconvenient as well as unscientific to have such overlapping in definition." What does Mr. Levy mean by this? I know of no logical principle which is violated by classing *Dreamers of the Ghetto* as Jewish literature from one point of view, and as English literature from another. Just as England, Jewry, and the clergy may, each for a different reason, claim, and rightly claim, Mr. Levy as one of their own, so English literature and Jewish literature may each for a different reason claim the same book.

Whatever Mr. Levy may or may not mean by condemning such multiple claims as "overlapping in definition," his real objection is clearly based on his general theory that "the language test is . . . the supreme and determining factor" in classifying the literature of the world. Why? Apparently because Mr. Levy holds "most strongly that the language in which the works are written is the sole and all-important criterion in any definition of literature." Such an *ipse dixit* may be very interesting, but it is no proof. And all that Mr. Levy furnishes by way of argument amounts to no more than such corroboration of his theory as may be afforded by expressions like English literature, German literature, &c., in which language is made the *fundamentum divisionis*. There are other expressions which do not bear out, and even seem to contradict, this dictum that "the language test is . . . the supreme and determining factor." Awkward exceptions these! But a theory is not so easily sacrificed to exceptions. Enough that Mr. Levy does not insist that the exceptions are only exceptions that prove his rule. He just tries to explain them away—no more. And this is how he does it. The word literature, Mr. Levy assures us, has two different meanings, a "generic" meaning, and a "specific" meaning. When qualified by a language epithet it is used in its generic meaning, otherwise in its specific meaning.

If in the course of an argument the distinction between these two meanings is not carefully observed, then, says Mr. Levy, "the first law of thought, the law of identity, is subtly violated." I cannot see that this is so. Let us examine Mr. Levy's own example, the expression psychological literature. The term psychological literature has, undoubtedly, a different denotation from the expression English or German literature. That is self-evident. But is it true to say that the meaning of the word literature is different in the two cases? The difference between the expressions English literature and psychological literature seems to be due entirely to the difference between "English" and "psychological," while "literature" seems to have the same meaning in both cases. Mr. Levy does not attempt to bring out the different meanings of the word literature in the two cases. He only remarks rather contemptuously that "there is an important difference between literature and bibliography." Of course there is. Only Mr. Levy himself does not seem to appreciate the difference. Does Mr. Levy mean to imply that psychological literature is the same as its bibliography? A descriptive list of psychological writings (as of any other writings) may be called bibliography. But psychological literature, like every other kind of literature, consists of the writings, not of the list.

We have thus considered all the objections which Mr. Levy has raised against non-linguistic classifications of literature, and found them wanting. The language test may or may not be the most common and obvious. If it is, that is due to the fact that when choosing what books to read our linguistic limitations must be one of our first considerations. But parallel with the linguistic classification, there are others just as legitimate, and often more significant and more useful. Quite as common, possibly more common than the linguistic differentiation, is the subject classification; literature on subjects of general interest, or on more specialized subjects such as the special

sciences and philosophical disciplines. It follows from the very nature of general literature that it is more generally read, thought of, and discussed than is the case with the remaining divisions of literature. Hence it comes about that the word literature is often used briefly for general literature. And this usage has no doubt misled Mr. Levy into thinking that the word literature has two different meanings, a generic and a specific. But that is not the case. Literature in the sense of general literature (and logic, be it remembered, claims the right to say explicitly general literature in all such cases) is but a division of literature in the same way and of the same order as, e.g., psychological literature is. Subject-matter as *fundamentum divisionis* may even seem more natural, or intrinsically more valuable, than the relatively more superficial language test; but both these, and many others, are perfectly valid. For in this, as in most things, value is relative to purpose. It may not be out of place to point out here that the linguistic test is of value chiefly as a *fundamentum divisionis* of general rather than special literature, though it is valid also in the latter. That is so because it is in general literature that the beauties of language as language find greatest scope. It is because Mr. Levy is chiefly thinking of general literature that the importance of the language test assumes such abnormal proportions in his eyes.

Prima facie, then, there can be no reasonable objection against the use of any significant characteristic as *fundamentum divisionis* of the world's literature, and then qualifying the several classes by the corresponding epithets. An inquiry as to what contributions different peoples or races have made to the world's literature may be just as interesting and important as a similar inquiry from a linguistic standpoint. In any case there is room for both; and neither attitude needs justification. When, therefore, Mr. Levy objects that the expression Jewish literature is illogical and inconvenient because "Jewish" is a racial,

not a linguistic distinction, our reply is, that the epithet, though non-linguistic, is perfectly logical, while frequent usage shows, as nothing else could show, that it is also very convenient.

Having thus cleared the ground of all the difficulties that Mr. Levy has found there, we may turn to consider, however briefly, the positive aspect of our inquiry. That there is a Jewish literature, of this even Mr. Levy has no doubt. From what precedes it should also be clear by now that the expression Jewish literature cannot be replaced by the expression Hebrew literature, as Mr. Levy would have it, for the simple reason that, as Mr. Levy himself insists, Hebrew is a linguistic, while Jewish is a non-linguistic *fundamentum divisionis*, and we may therefore reasonably assume that the terms Hebrew literature and Jewish literature denote two different divisions of the world's literature, however much they may have in common. Their actual relation will be seen from what follows.

The positive side of our inquiry may be formulated in two questions: (1) What does the expression Jewish literature denote? (2) Is the expression Jewish literature appropriate for its avowed purpose?

(1) What does the expression Jewish literature denote? To judge by ordinary usage, which is also sanctioned by the standard works on the subject, viz. Graetz, Karpeles, Steinschneider, Winter and Wuensche, and various articles in well-known encyclopedias, the denotation of the expression Jewish literature includes all writings of Jewish authorship. To make this statement perfectly explicit, I will state at once that the term Jew denotes any member of our people, race, or community, without any distinction as to the age or country in which he lives or lived, or as to the language employed.

It is quite true that the name, by which the members of the southern kingdom alone were originally denoted, did not receive its wider application till after the exile, as

Mr. Levy reminds us—though, of course, he cannot really mean the word "Jew," which is of very much later origin. But that is a matter of etymology and of history, which, interesting as it is, does not really concern us here. What does concern us is the present, actual application of the name Jew. And in actual usage the word Jew is simply the most comprehensive name by which we denote any and every member of our people or community without any restriction whatsoever. The expressions Hebrew (in the sense of a Hebrew), Israelite, and Judaean are also applied to our people, but generally with definite geographic and historical limitations (though even these distinctions are sometimes effaced); not so with the expression Jew, which never implies any special reference to time or place. This may be seen easily enough from the very names of the standard works on our whole history. "History of the Jews" is the usual title—though they treat of our pre-exilic as well as of our post-exilic history, and set themselves no geographical limits. It is, therefore, quite in agreement with this usage that the expression Jewish literature = literature of the Jews, in the widest sense. Any work written by one of our people, at any time, in any land, and in any language, is included in Jewish literature.

And here it may be well to note that there are four cognate expressions in general use, the very briefest considerations of which may make matters clearer. The four expressions I refer to are: (*a*) Jewish literature; (*b*) Hebrew literature; (*c*) Judaica; (*d*) Hebraica. The first of these, Jewish literature, has already been explained. It is based on a purely racial distinction. The second, Hebrew literature, rests on a purely linguistic *fundamentum*. Just as the first ignores everything except the author's racial origin or connexion, so the second singles out for consideration only the language in which the work is written. Hebrew literature includes everything written in Hebrew, no matter where, when, or by whom. The remaining two

expressions, viz. Hebraica and Judaica, have content or subject-matter for their *fundamentum*, which is to that extent more intrinsic than the relatively external test of race or language. Hebraica is generally used to denote works bearing on the study of Hebrew language and literature, no matter who the author by whom they were written, or what the language in which they were written. Such works will from their very character either be in Hebrew or at any rate contain a great deal of Hebrew. Similarly Judaica include all works treating of Jewish topics, other than Hebrew language or literature, no matter by whom, or in what language they are written, provided they are not in Hebrew. As regards the mutual inter-relations of the denotations of these four terms one may briefly put it this way: at present, and for obvious reasons, Jewish literature includes practically the whole of Hebrew literature, though there is no inherent reason why this should necessarily be so, except that even Jews do not find Hebrew to be the most convenient or most serviceable medium. Again, all Hebrew literature is included under Hebraica, but also much besides, viz. all bibliographical, lexicographical, and grammatical works on Hebrew language and literature, not written in Hebrew, and, therefore, not included in Hebrew literature. Hebraica and Judaica are mutually exclusive divisions, and each of them only partly included in Jewish literature. One more expression we must take cognizance of in this connexion, viz. Yiddish literature. This, like Hebrew literature, is based on a linguistic distinction, and what applies to Hebrew literature applies, *mutatis mutandis*, also to Yiddish literature. Whatever our attitude may be as to the merits of Yiddish, whether we tolerate it or condemn it, we are compelled to recognize it as a European language, and, of European languages, as peculiar to the Jews of modern times as Hebrew, among Oriental languages, was to the Jews of old. That much, at any rate, Yiddish and Hebrew have in common, however unlike in other respects. Although

Yiddish, like Hebrew, might be written by non-Jews, still the fact remains that only Jews do write Yiddish. Like Hebrew literature, therefore, Yiddish literature forms a branch of Jewish literature; but unlike Hebrew literature, the bulk of Yiddish literature comes under Judaica, not under Hebraica. Yiddish cannot possibly be treated as a dialect of Hebrew, even though written in Hebrew characters. One does not alter the character of a language simply by adopting this or that alphabet. One alphabet may serve many different languages; but different languages do not become one language, or even co-dialects, through being represented by the same set of symbols.

The accompanying tables (see Appendix) are intended to show more precisely the process and the result of our classification of literature for specifically Jewish purposes. The mutual relations between the divisions denoted by the several terms just explained are those implicitly, if not explicitly, underlying ordinary usage in these matters. To make the schemes logically complete allowance must be made for the possibility both of Hebrew and Yiddish writings by non-Jewish authors, whether or not such writings actually exist, or whether they exist only to an insignificant extent. The tables will also show the possibility of avoiding even the appearance of cross-division, if that is what Mr. Levy means by "overlapping in definition." The first classification is a very simple one, and treats only of the interrelations between the divisions based on the racial and the linguistic *fundamenta*; the second table includes also the subject *fundamentum*, from which it starts. Other schemes will easily suggest themselves to those interested in such matters.

(2) We are now in a position to consider the second question, Is the expression Jewish literature appropriate? Mr. Levy says it is not, because it is based on a racial test. But this, we have already seen, is no valid objection. Again, Mr. Levy says that "the expression 'Jewish' literature is incorrect, and that we must substitute for it 'Hebrew'

literature." And he is satisfied that he has made a "consistent attempt to define the scope of what has hitherto been erroneously known as Jewish literature, but which should more correctly be called Hebrew literature." If, however, we examine Mr. Levy's reasoning very closely, we shall find that his arguments amount to just this: Jewish literature ought not to mean what it actually does mean, but something else; and Hebrew literature ought not to mean what it does mean; in fact Jewish literature and Hebrew literature should mean exactly the same thing if they would only mean what they ought to mean, but do not mean. Now what they ought to mean, according to Mr. Levy, is something less unlike Hebrew literature than Jewish literature, *ergo* we must drop the expression Jewish literature, speak only of Hebrew literature, and mean by it something which at present it does not mean. In the first place, he arbitrarily restricts in one direction and extends in another direction the scope of Jewish literature so as to include all that is generally known as Hebrew and Yiddish literature and nothing else. He, then, as arbitrarily, extends the scope of Hebrew literature so as to include also Yiddish literature. After that the substitution of Hebrew for Jewish literature is a very simple matter. That such a procedure is arbitrary to a degree is self-evident. That the introduction of a new terminology may only make confusion worse confounded, that, too, is not unlikely. Such objections need not be fatal. But in any case we have a right to ask, What advantages does Mr. Levy's new terminology offer? None, it would seem. On the contrary it would only introduce new difficulties. In the first place, if we want to refer to what Mr. Levy calls Hebrew literature, we can do so just as well, more correctly in fact, and with greater precision, by using the expressions Hebrew and Yiddish literature, either in combination or separately, as the case may be. In the second place, Mr. Levy's terminology, if adopted, would deprive us of our present means of easy, natural, and direct reference to

what is now, both conveniently and correctly, called simply Jewish literature. While, lastly, if we retain, as no doubt we shall retain, the present application of the three terms, Jewish, Hebrew, and Yiddish literature, the remaining two expressions, Hebraica and Judaica, fit in beautifully so as to form a complete scheme of cross-reference, which enables us to characterize and indicate any book or group of books in which Jews as such must be specially interested, with a nicety and precision to which Mr. Levy's terminology does not lend itself.

We conclude, therefore, that Mr. Levy has not made out his case. His "first consistent attempt to define the scope of what has hitherto been erroneously known as Jewish literature, but which should more correctly be called Hebrew literature," does not seem to me to have succeeded in its avowed purpose. What has hitherto been called Jewish literature will continue to be called Jewish literature, not erroneously but quite correctly. Similarly Hebrew and Yiddish literature will retain their old application: Yiddish literature will not be called Hebrew literature, nor will the expression Hebrew literature be substituted for Jewish literature. Things remain where they were. Still Mr. Levy's attempt must not be considered futile. His article has, at any rate, brought to clear light some of the intricacies of Jewish literature, some of those peculiarities which make it a true reflex of Jewish history. It may also have helped some to a better appreciation of the existing terminology used in connexion with the different kinds of literature of specific Jewish interest.

APPENDIX.

Table I.

Literature	A. By Jewish Authors (Jewish literature)	Written in Hebrew	(1)
		,, Yiddish	(2)
		,, other languages	(3)
	B. By non-Jewish Authors	Written in Hebrew	(4)
		,, Yiddish	(5)
		,, other languages	(6)

Jewish literature includes divisions (1), (2), (3).
Hebrew ,, ,, ,, (1), (4).
Yiddish ,, ,, ,, (2), (5).

Table II.

Literature	Of specific Jewish interest	Hebraica	Written all in Hebrew	By Jews	(1)
				By non-Jews	(2)
			Written in some other language	By Jews	(3)
				By non-Jews	(4)
		Judaica	Written in Yiddish	By Jews	(5)
				By non-Jews	(6)
			Written in some other language	By Jews	(7)
				By non-Jews	(8)
	On other subjects			By Jews	(9)
				By non-Jews	(10)

Hebraica and Judaica together, it will be seen from the second table, exhaust all works the contents of which are of specific Jewish interest.

Jewish literature consists of divisions (1), (3), (5), (7), (9).
Hebrew ,, ,, ,, (1), (2).
Yiddish ,, ,, ,, (5), (6).

III.

BY THE REV. S. LEVY, M.A.

READERS of Olive Schreiner's *Story of a South African Farm* will no doubt remember Mr. Bonaparte Blenkinsop. The boy-hero of the story has been devoting his untutored genius to the invention of a wonderful piece of mechanism. Mr. Bonaparte Blenkinsop asks to see it. He examines it very closely for a little while, then stamps on it and smashes it into pieces. "Looks nicer now, doesn't it?" he exclaims, with a brutal grin.

I readily exonerate my critics from the charge of displaying the deliberate cruelty of Mr. Bonaparte Blenkinsop, but all the same they have not treated my little effort with any excess of tenderness. Prof. Bacher and the Rev. A. Wolf have evidently read my article with scrupulous care. They have subjected it to severe but valuable criticism, and I frankly pay tribute to the remarkable force with which they have presented the opposite view. It is in no spirit of obstinacy, however, that I still remain of my first opinion. They have failed to convince me of the error of my reasoning, but I am able to associate myself with them and say with them of my original contribution, "It looks nicer now, doesn't it?" For had I the opportunity of re-stating my proposition at reasonable length, I am under the impression that I could utilize to advantage the supplementary data furnished by both of my critics, and with their help make my position almost impregnable. I should, however, be abusing the courtesy of the Editors who have kindly provided me with the opportunity of having the last word, if I unduly trespassed on the valuable space of the REVIEW. I must therefore content myself with offering a few brief notes in reply, to clear up certain misconceptions. Perhaps in the end we shall find that at all events Prof. Bacher and myself agree with each other to a greater extent than is apparent at first sight.

A.

The Rev. A. Wolf has criticized my system of investigation, but on examining the method he suggests I should have adopted, I find it to be exactly the one I pursued. I carefully enumerated the various classes of writings generally included under the designation "Jewish literature." I then found that according to all analogies, Jewish literature had to be narrowed down to works written in Hebrew. I thereupon argued that the term "Jewish literature," covering all works written by Jews in *all* languages, was not sufficiently appropriate to its actual application, and that therefore the expression "Hebrew literature" answered the purpose much better.

B.

What is the real reason why the view I advocate does not win ready acceptance? It lies in the fact that my critics are appalled by the mass of literature excluded by my definition. They seem to be haunted by the fear that what is thus shut out will be entirely neglected. They are naturally keenly anxious to avert such a danger, and so they widen the scope of Jewish literature beyond its true confines of Hebrew literature. "Only think what according to Levy does not belong to Jewish literature. The whole literature of Jewish Hellenism, the Arabic writings of the representatives of the Jewish spirit in the flourishing period of the Middle Ages, the works in which the modern science of Judaism was founded and developed in as far as they were not written in Hebrew, all these expressions of the Jewish spirit have not to be regarded as Jewish literature" (Prof. Bacher).

But my anticipation of this objection seems to have escaped Prof. Bacher's observation. "I hope no one thinks I am arguing against a cosmopolitan taste in literature, and recommending that, even if we could, we should restrict our reading to works written in the Hebrew language. There are of course many contributions made

both by Jews and non-Jews to the literatures of the world, which are not Hebrew literature because not written in Hebrew, but which we may nevertheless study with advantage, either as Jews or as children of the world" (*J. Q. R.*, XV, 592–3).

The truly cultured Jew, like the truly cultured man, aims at width of reading, but width of reading may cover different literatures. I may study Mappo in Hebrew literature, Heine in German literature, and Zangwill in English literature, but that would not justify me in classifying the works of these three authors under the heading of Hebrew literature. My critics retort that I should call them Jewish literature because written by Jews, but all the same they have not satisfactorily explained why in dealing with the literatures of the world the epithet applied to the literature should be *linguistic*, and why in the case of Jewish literature the epithet should suddenly and exceptionally become *racial.*

In fact, Prof. Bacher himself feels the difficulty of consistently maintaining that Jewish literature always connotes writings of Jewish authorship, and is compelled for a time to change the *fundamentum divisionis* from *race* to *subject-matter.*

"No one, for the greater fame of Jewish literature, will draw the circle of Jewish literature so large as to include in it the productions of Jewish writers, when the contents have no reference to Judaism. Süsskind von Trimberg, the German *Minnesinger*, well deserves mention in the history of the Jews, but his poems do not belong to Jewish literature, but form an integral part of German literature" (Prof. Bacher).

Does not Prof. Bacher in this passage come near to the adoption of my view? I never argued that Jewish authors who do not write their works in Hebrew should be excluded from Jewish *history*, but I did and do contend that non-Hebrew writings by Jews should not be included in *Hebrew literature.*

According to Prof. Bacher, *Dreamers of the Ghetto* by Zangwill is Jewish literature, because it has reference to Jews or Judaism, but *The Master* by the same author is English literature, because it is not of Jewish interest. But why does Prof. Bacher draw this distinction, if he holds that whatever is written by a Jew is Jewish literature? Mr. Wolf on the other hand would classify both as Jewish literature, because they are of Jewish authorship. Thus do my critics dispose of each other.

I am now able to turn the tables upon my critics. They think that by limiting the scope of Jewish literature to Hebrew literature, I create the possibility of Jews neglecting the study of the contributions made by Jews to the literatures of the world. But I can retort that, in consequence of Prof. Bacher and Mr. Wolf ignoring the linguistic test of the boundaries of a literature, they are so enlarging the territory of Jewish literature that Hebrew literature does not obtain its proportionate treatment. It is true that *en passant* Prof. Bacher refers to the modern revival of Hebrew, but on the whole, both of my critics attach little importance to the fact that the chain of Hebrew literature was not snapped by the schools of Mendelssohn and the French Revolution. Although I am here primarily concerned with the task of accurate definition, I may be permitted emphatically to point out that in consequence of Jewish literature being interpreted as literature of Jewish authorship, the Hebrew literature of the nineteenth century has by no means received the earnest attention it so richly deserves[1]. It should be remembered that great Hebrew writers lived *after* Agamemnon. As far as I can gather, a Hebrew work of the nineteenth century rarely, if ever, finds a place in the curricula of theological seminaries, whether it be in England, on the Continent, or in America. Judging from my own limited reading, I think it not at all improbable that the Hebrew literature of the

[1] This omission has been partly rectified by N. Slouschz, *La renaissance de la littérature hébraïque* (1743–1885), Paris, 1902.

nineteenth century will be found to be of greater importance than the Judaica of the same period. And for this reason. Whereas all the Judaica of any permanent worth, e. g. Graetz and Güdemann, are at once translated into Hebrew, there is far less enterprise shown in rendering the valuable Hebrew literature of the nineteenth century into European languages. Before the *Jewish Encyclopaedia* in English is half completed, the scheme for a *Hebrew Encyclopaedia* is already launched forth and the financial basis of the new undertaking fully guaranteed.

C.

It is interesting to note with what avidity both Prof. Bacher and Mr. Wolf have pounced upon "Yiddish" literature as the weak spot in my armoury, *after* I myself had called attention to the difficulty of this instance [1]. "Yiddish" is as a matter of fact regarded by some as a dialect of Hebrew, and by others it is classed as a European language. But Jews cannot have it both ways. The mass of Jews in Eastern Europe place it with Hebrew, and a Zionist thinker has recently argued that in a Jewish state Yiddish will have to be recognized as the national language on an equal footing with Hebrew [2]. According to this view, I am perfectly entitled to include "Yiddish" literature in Hebrew literature.

But if on the other hand, as maintained by Prof. Bacher and Mr. Wolf, Yiddish is a European language, then I am

[1] In this connexion the following passage from Cairnes, *Logical Method of Political Economy*, pp. 139–41, deserves mention : "It is no valid objection to a classification, nor, consequently, to the definition founded upon it, that instances may be found which fall or seem to fall on our lines of demarcation. The classification, and therefore the definition, is a good one, if in the instances which do *not* fall on the line, the distinctions marked by the definition are such as it is important to mark, such that the recognition of them will help the inquirer forward towards the desiderated goal."

[2] A. Coralnik, *Der Kampf um die Sprache*, in the 'Jüdischer Volkskalender,' 5664, pp. 20–30.

quite prepared to return Yiddish literature to the literatures of Europe. But it is important to note that whichever conclusion be accepted, the validity of the linguistic test is not affected in the smallest degree.

D.

I have already expressed my appreciation of the value of the suggestions of both Prof. Bacher and Mr. Wolf, but whereas Mr. Wolf to the end rigidly defends the extreme definition of Jewish literature as comprising all writings of Jewish authorship, Prof. Bacher makes some weighty admissions in favour of my view of restricting the scope of Jewish literature to Hebrew literature.

I may modestly claim it as a great achievement when a critic of Prof. Bacher's eminence yields important concessions to my theory, points the way to a possible compromise, and practically takes a long step in the direction of ultimately accepting my position in its entirety.

Prof. Bacher agrees with me in excluding from either Hebrew or Jewish literature works written by Gentiles in languages other than Hebrew, although bearing on, or inspired by, Jews or Judaism. [Class (IV) in my scheme, *J. Q. R.*, XV, 601.]

"Basnage's *Histoire des Juifs* and Franz Delitzsch's *Zur Geschichte der jüdischen Poesie* may find a place among the works of Jewish authors dealing with Jewish history and Hebrew poetry, but they must not on that account be classified as Jewish literature" (Prof. Bacher).

By implication, Prof. Bacher thus endorses my criticism of Karpeles who describes the activity of Gentile writers like the Buxtorfs, as falling within the range of Jewish literature.

Prof. Bacher further accepts my contention that we should not include in Hebrew or Jewish literature works written by Jews in languages other than Hebrew, *not* bearing on, or inspired by, Jews or Judaism. [Class (V) in my scheme, *J. Q. R.*, XV, 601.]

The issue between Prof. Bacher and myself is now extremely narrow. We only differ as to the classification of works written by Jews in languages other than Hebrew, but bearing on, or inspired by, Jews or Judaism. [Class (III) in my scheme, *J. Q. R.*, XV, 601.]

Prof. Bacher is loth to shut them out from Jewish literature, but I feel no hesitation in excluding them from Hebrew literature. At all events, the fence between us is now cut down so low that we shall probably soon shake hands over it in perfect harmony of view. Prof. Bacher has already shown such generosity in his attitude towards my theory by admitting the partial breakdown of the racial criterion of Jewish literature, that I feel justified in maintaining the linguistic test without any reservation, and in still holding that we should therefore more correctly speak of Hebrew literature.